

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of June 11, 2008, claims 1-4 and 9-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0179220 A1 (“Dietrich”) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,567,095 (“Wood”). In addition, claims 5-8, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Dietrich in view of Wood, U.S. Patent Application Number 2001/0012018 A1 (“Hayhurst”), U.S. Patent Application Number 2001/0036307 A1 (“Hanna et al.”), U.S. Patent Number 6,269,175 (“Hanna et al.”) and/or U.S. Patent Application Number 2003/0145008 A1 (“Burrell”).

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1 and 9 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references of Dietrich and Wood. Claim 5 has also been amended. As amended, the independent claims 1 and 9 are not obvious in view of the cited references of Dietrich and Wood, as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims 1-14 be allowed.

A. Patentability of Independent Claims 1 and 9

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites in part “*a rasterizer configured to transverse a surface grid over a surface of a primitive of a 3D image for all N different views of said 3D image such that transversing is performed once for said 3D image*” and “*N screen space resamplers, each of said screen space resamplers being configured to resample the shaded color sample determined by said shader unit according to one of the N different views such that resampling is performed N times in parallel for said 3D image,*” which are not disclosed in the cited references of Dietrich and Wood. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Dietrich and Wood. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The cited reference of Dietrich discloses a graphics system (106) that includes a rasterizer (152) and a sample expansion stage (154), as shown in Fig. 1A-1. The rasterizer of Dietrich is described in paragraph [0048] as computing “a fragment for each pixel covered by each of the primitives.” There is no mention that the rasterizer (152) of Dietrich is configured “*to transverse a surface grid over a surface of a primitive of a 3D image for all N different views of said 3D image such that transversing is performed once for said 3D image,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the cited reference of Dietrich does not disclose the claimed “*rasterizer*” of the amended independent claim 1. In addition, the sample expansion stage (154) of Dietrich is not described as being equivalent to the claimed “*N screen space resamplers, each of said screen space resamplers being configured to resample the shaded color sample determined by said shader unit according to one of the N different views such that resampling is performed N times in parallel for said 3D image,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the cited reference of Dietrich also does not disclose the claimed “*N screen space resamplers*” of the amended independent claim 1.

The cited reference of Wood discloses a circuit arrangement and display apparatus for use in 3-D graphics. Although the cited reference of Wood discloses a four-view screen, as shown in Fig. 4, the cited reference of Wood does not disclose “*a rasterizer configured to transverse a surface grid over a surface of a primitive of a 3D image for all N different views of said 3D image such that transversing is performed once for said 3D image,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. In fact, there is no mention of any rasterizer in Wood. Thus, Applicants fail to see how the teachings of Wood can be applied to the rasterizer (152) of Dietrich. The cited reference of Wood also does not disclose “*N screen space resamplers, each of said screen space resamplers being configured to resample the shaded color sample determined by said shader unit according to one of the N different views such that resampling is performed N times in parallel for said 3D image,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1.

Since the cited references of Dietrich and Wood do not disclose the limitations with respect to the claimed “*rasterizer*” and “*N screen space resamplers,*” these references even if combined do not teach all the limitations of the amended

independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Dietrich and Wood. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claim 9, which recites limitations similar to those of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, the amended independent claim 9 is also not obvious in view of the cited references of Dietrich and Wood. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 9 be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-8 and 10-14

Each of the dependent claims 2-8 and 10-14 depends on one of the independent claims 1 and 9. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Furthermore, these dependent claims may be allowable for additional reasons.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Barenbrug et al.

Date: October 14, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300